

INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE
IOC DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION
DECISION

REGARDING ANIS ANANENKA

BORN ON 29 NOVEMBER 1985, ATHLETE, RUNNER (NATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE OF BELARUS)

(Rule 59.2.1 of the Olympic Charter)

In application of the Olympic Charter and, in particular, Rule 59.2.1 thereof, and the IOC Anti-Doping Rules applicable to the Games of the XXX Olympiad, London 2012 (the “**Rules**”) and, in particular, Articles 1,2, 6.3.3, 7, 8, and 9 thereof:

I. FACTS

1. Anis ANANENKA (the “**Athlete**”), participated in the Games of the XXX Olympiad, London 2012 (the “**2012 Olympic Games**”) as a team member of the National Olympic Committee of Belarus.
2. On 6 August 2012, the Athlete competed in Round 1 of the Men’s 800m, finishing 43rd overall.
3. On 8 August 2012, the Athlete was requested to provide urine samples for a doping control. Such samples was identified with the numbers 2721269 and 2721155.
4. The A-Sample 2721269 and A-Sample 2721155 were analysed during the 2012 Olympic Games by the WADA-accredited Laboratory in London. The analysis did not result in an adverse analytical finding at that time.
5. After the conclusion of the 2012 Olympic Games, all the samples collected upon the occasion of the 2012 Olympic Games were transferred to the WADA-accredited Laboratory in Lausanne, Switzerland (the “**Laboratory**”) for long-term storage.
6. The IOC decided to perform further analyses on samples collected during the 2012 Olympic Games. These additional analyses were notably conducted with improved analytical methods in order to possibly detect Prohibited Substances which could not be identified by the analysis performed at the time of the 2012 Olympic Games.
7. The IOC decided that the re-analysis process would be conducted as a regular A and B sample analysis, without resorting to a splitting of the B-Sample.
8. The remains of the A-Sample 2721269 and A-Sample 2721155 was analysed by the Laboratory and resulted in an Adverse Analytical Finding (“**AAF**”) as it showed the presence of Dehydrochlormethyltestosterone metabolites in both samples, a Prohibited Substance (Class S1.1a – Anabolic Androgenic Steroids).
9. The results were reported to the IOC in accordance with Art. 6.2.1 of the Rules.

10. Further to the verifications set forth in Art. 6.2.2 of the Rules and in application of Art. 6.2.3 of the Rules, the IOC President, Mr Thomas Bach, was informed of the existence of the AAF and the essential details available concerning the case.
11. Pursuant to Art. 7.2.4 of the Rules, the IOC President set up a Disciplinary Commission, consisting in this case of:
 - Prof. Denis Oswald, Chairman;
 - Mrs. Gunilla Lindberg; and
 - Mr. Juan Antonio Samaranch.
12. The IOC has delegated the implementation of the Doping Control program for the 2012 Olympic Games to the International Testing Agency (the “**ITA**”). Such delegation includes the conduct of re-analysis of the samples collected during the 2012 Olympic Games and the related results management.
13. On 17 December 2018, the ITA notified the Athlete, through the National Olympic Committee of the Republic of Belarus (the “**NOC**”), of the above-mentioned AAF and of the institution of disciplinary proceedings to be conducted by the Disciplinary Commission. By means of an Athlete Rights Form to be completed by the Athlete, the ITA informed the Athlete of his right to request the opening and analysis of the B-Sample and to attend this process, either in person and/or through a representative, and of his right to request a copy of the laboratory documentation package.
14. The Athlete was also given the possibility to refer the matter for adjudication before the Court of Arbitration for Sport in Lausanne, Switzerland, by means of an arbitration agreement.
15. On 17 December 2018, the International Association of Athletics Federations (“**IAAF**”) was also informed of the Athlete’s AAF notification and invited the IAAF to take the necessary actions under Art. 8.3 of the Rules.
16. On 3 January 2019, the NOC informed the ITA that the Athlete was notified of the AAF but that the Athlete had retired and decided not to complete the Athlete Rights Form. The Athlete would also not sign the arbitration agreement included with the AAF notification.
17. On 11 January 2019, the ITA responded to the NOC, taking note that the Athlete was duly notified pursuant to Art. 6.3.3 of the Rules. The ITA also informed the NOC that according to Art. 7.6 of the Rules, the retirement of an athlete has no bearing on the results management process, which shall be pursued regardless of the Athlete’s retirement. Accordingly, the NOC was asked to request that the Athlete complete the Athlete Rights Form, and respond to the arbitration agreement proposal. Should the Athlete not respond by 18 January 2019, he would be deemed to have waived his rights to request a B-Sample analysis and request a copy of the laboratory documentation package. The Athlete would also be deemed to have rejected the possibility of referring the matter to the Court of Arbitration for Sport.
18. On 18 January 2019, the NOC informed the ITA that the Athlete had been contacted but refused to complete the Athlete Rights Form. The Athlete also rejected the arbitration agreement. Effectively, the Athlete is refusing to participate in the proceedings.

19. On 22 January 2019, the ITA gave the Athlete through the NOC a final deadline of 28 January 2019 to complete the Athlete Rights Form and respond to the arbitration agreement proposal. Failure to do so would be deemed a waiver of his rights detailed above.
20. On 30 January 2019, the ITA informed the Athlete through the NOC that due to his failure to respond, he was deemed to have waived his rights to request the B-Sample analysis and request a copy of the laboratory documentation package. The Athlete was also deemed to have rejected the possibility to refer the matter to the Court of Arbitration for Sport.
21. Consequently, on 30 January 2019, the ITA confirmed that the matter would be referred to the IOC Disciplinary Commission to issue its decision on the basis of the file.

II. APPLICABLE RULES

22. Art. 1 of the Rules provides as follows:

“Application of the Code – Definition of Doping – Breach of the Rules

1.1 The commission of an anti-doping rule violation is a breach of these Rules.

1.2 Subject to the specific following provisions of the Rules below, the provisions of the Code and of the International Standards apply mutatis mutandis in relation to the London Olympic Games.”

23. Art. 2 of the Rules provides that Article 2 of the Code applies to determine anti-doping rule violations.

24. Art. 2.1 of the Code provides that the following constitutes an anti-doping rule violation:

“Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete’s Sample.

1.1.1 It is each Athlete’s personal duty to ensure that no Prohibited Substance enters his or her body. Athletes are responsible for any Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers found to be present in their Samples. Accordingly, it is not necessary that intent, fault, negligence or knowing Use on the Athlete’s part be demonstrated in order to establish an anti-doping violation under Article 2.1.

1.1.2 Sufficient proof of an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.1 is established by either of the following: presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in the Athlete’s A Sample where the Athlete waives analysis of the B Sample and the B Sample is not analysed; or, where the Athlete’s B Sample is analysed and the analysis of the Athlete’s B Sample confirms the presence of the Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers found in the Athlete’s A Sample.

1.1.3 Excepting those substances for which a quantitative threshold is specifically identified in the Prohibited List, the presence of any quantity of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete’s Sample shall constitute an anti-doping rule violation.

1.1.4 As an exception to the general rule of Article 2.1, the Prohibited List or International Standards may establish special criteria for the evaluation of Prohibited Substances that can also be produced endogenously.”

25. Art. 2.2 of the Code provides the following constitutes an anti-doping rule violation:

“Use or Attempted Use by an Athlete of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method.

2.2.1 It is each Athlete’s personal duty to ensure that no Prohibited Substance enters his or her body. Accordingly, it is not necessary that intent, fault, negligence or knowing Use on the Athlete’s part be demonstrated in order to establish an anti-doping rule violation for Use of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method.

2.2.2 The success or failure of the Use or Attempted Use of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method is not material. It is sufficient that the Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method was Used or Attempted to be Used for an anti-doping rule violation to be committed.”

26. Art. 6.3.3 of the Rules provides as follows:

“Notice to an Athlete or other Person who has been accredited pursuant to the request of the NOC, may be accomplished by delivery of the notice to the NOC. Notification to the Chef de Mission or the President or the Secretary General of the NOC of the Athlete or other Person shall be deemed to be delivery of notice to the NOC.”

27. Art. 7.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

“A violation of these Rules in Individual Sports in connection with Doping Control automatically leads to Disqualification of the Athlete’s results in the Competition in question, with all other consequences, including forfeiture of any medals, points and prizes.”

28. Art. 8.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

“An anti-doping rule violation occurring or in connection with the London Olympic Games may lead to Disqualification of all the Athlete’s results obtained in the London Olympic Games with all consequences, including forfeiture of all medals, points and prizes, except as provided in Article 8.1.1.”

29. Art. 8.1.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

“If the Athlete establishes that he or she bears No Fault or Negligence for the violation, the Athlete’s results in the Competitions (for which the Athlete’s results have not been automatically Disqualified as per Article 7.1 hereof) shall not be Disqualified unless the Athlete’s results in Competitions other than the Competition in which the anti-doping rule violation occurred were likely to have been affected by the Athlete’s anti-doping rule violation.”

30. Art. 8.3 of the Rules provides as follows:

“The Consequences of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and the conduct of additional hearings as a consequence of hearings and decisions of the IOC, including with regard to the imposition of sanctions over and above those relating to the London Olympic Games, shall be managed by the relevant International Federation.”

31. Art. 9.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

“Where more than one member of a team in a Team Sport has been notified of a possible anti-doping rule violation under Article 6 in connection with the London Olympic Games, the team shall be subject to Target Testing for the London Olympic Games.

In Team Sports, if more than one team member is found to have committed an anti-doping rule violation during the Period of the London Olympic Games, the team may be subject to Disqualification or other disciplinary action, as provided in the applicable rules of the relevant International Federation.

In sports which are not Team Sports but where awards are given to teams, if one or more team members have committed an anti-doping rule violation during the Period of the London Olympic Games, the team may be subject to Disqualification, and/or other disciplinary action as provided in the applicable rules of the relevant International Federation.”

III. DISCUSSION

32. The results of the analysis of the samples provided by the Athlete establish the presence in his samples of the metabolites of a Prohibited Substance, *i.e.* Dehydrochloromethyltestosterone metabolites.
33. The substance detected in the Athlete's samples is an anabolic steroid. It is listed in the WADA 2012 Prohibited List and in all subsequent lists under S1.
34. The NOC confirmed that the Athlete has been actually notified. In any event, notification of the Athlete is deemed accomplished through the NOC pursuant to Art. 6.3.3 of the Rules.
35. Despite being notified, the Athlete refused to complete the Athlete Rights Form and, despite being offered to do so, to participate in the analytical process in any manner. The Athlete notably did not request the analysis of the B-Sample. He is thus deemed to have waived his corresponding right. The B-Sample was consequently not analysed.
36. In accordance with Art. 2.1 of the Code, when the B-Sample analysis is waived, the result of the A-Sample analysis is sufficient to establish an anti-doping rule violation.
37. Based on such result, the Athlete is found to have committed an anti-doping rule violation pursuant to Art. 2.1 of the Code consisting of the presence of a Prohibited Substance in his body.
38. In addition, the Disciplinary Commission finds that an anti-doping rule violation would also be established if the present circumstances were considered with regard to Art. 2.2 of the Code.

39. The substance which was found in the Athlete's sample is a substance (known under its common name as "oralturinabol") then commonly used as a doping substance, notably because it was both efficient and then detectable only for a short period of time after its ingestion (only a few days) given the sensitivity of the analytical methods available at that time.
40. The detection of this substance through long term metabolites started to be implemented only after the London Olympic Games. This new method massively increased the window of detection of oralturinabol, from a few days to up to two months or more. This significant improvement in the efficiency of the detection of oralturinabol led to an unprecedented wave of positive cases in the re-analysis of samples collected on the occasion of both the 2008 and 2012 Olympic Games.
41. In this context, the finding of oralturinabol is therefore clearly consistent with its use for doping purposes in circumstances in which the Athlete, based on the then known window of detection, could be counting that it would not be detected on the occasion of the doping controls performed during the Olympic Games. The absence of any explanation on the part of the Athlete only reinforces a corresponding inference.
42. Under the Rules, the applicable consequences of the anti-doping rule violation specifically relate to the 2012 Olympic Games.
43. In application of Art. 7.1 and 8.1 of the Rules, the results achieved by the Athlete during the 2012 Olympic Games shall be annulled, with all resulting consequences (notably withdrawal of medals, diplomas, pins etc.).
44. Accordingly, the results obtained by the Athlete at the Men's 800m shall be annulled.
45. In application of Art. 8.3 of the Rules, the consequences of the anti-doping rule violations, and in particular the imposition of sanctions over and above those related to the 2012 Olympic Games, shall be managed by the IAAF.

* * * * *

CONSIDERING the above, pursuant to the Olympic Charter and, in particular, Rule 59.2.1 thereof, and pursuant to the IOC Anti-Doping Rules applicable to the Games of the XXX Olympiad in London in 2012 and, in particular, Articles 1, 2, 6.3.3, 7, 8, and 9 thereof

THE DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE
DECIDES

- I. The Athlete, Anis Ananenka:
 - i) is found to to have committed an anti-doping rule violation pursuant to the IOC Anti-Doping Rules applicable to the Games of the XXX Olympiad in London in 2012 (presence and/or use, of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an athlete's bodily specimen), and
 - ii) is disqualified from the events in which he participated upon the occasion of the 2012 Olympic Games, namely, the Men's 800m event.
- II. The IAAF is requested to modify the results of the above-mentioned event accordingly and to consider any further action within its own competence.
- III. The National Olympic Committee of Belarus shall ensure full implementation of this decision.
- IV. The decision enters into force immediately.

Lausanne, 27 March 2019

In the name of the IOC Disciplinary Commission



Prof. Denis Oswald



Gunilla Lindberg



Juan Antonio Samaranch